Minutes
Toll Bridge Advisory Committee
Meeting of July 26, 2002

Project Submittal Outline and Evaluation Process

A number of specific questions were answered:

- Projects may apply for only operating funds if capital funds are covered elsewhere or vice versa.
- Funds are intended for new services and support for those services. For example, if a new service requires additional maintenance facilities, those maintenance facilities may be eligible.

Bob McCleary, CCTA, stated that his board wishes to see more analysis of who will pay the toll. Randy Rentschler, MTC, distributed maps showing origins and destinations of peak period vehicle trips on the Benicia-Martinez Bridge, Carquinez, and Bay Bridge. MTC will prepare this data in tabular format, summarized at the county and super district level. A discussion of the slow overall growth rate in toll traffic ensued.

Use of Toll Revenues: Capital/Operating Split

The Select Committee is working under the direction that the bridge revenue split overall will be 50% for capital and 50% for operating. Any increase in operating costs over time (due to inflation) must be covered either through fare box recovery rates or other identified funding sources. The process will address the full lifecycle costs of projects. Standard assumptions regarding lifecycle will be provided. It was noted that the actual spilt of operating vs. capital will result in the legislative process

Performance Measures Discussion

Because each project has different objectives, projects will not be subject to a standard set of performance measures. Project sponsors will need to select measures that illustrate the project benefits, but may also need to address requests from the Committee during the evaluation process for additional measures. Sponsors may also need to respond to inquiries from staff about how measures were calculated. Sponsors will have adequate time to respond to such requests.

Lisa Klein, MTC, presented the attached list of illustrative performance measures that sponsors might find useful to illustrate the benefits of their projects. The measures should be familiar; they are from the Regional Transit Expansion Plan, the Blueprint for the 21st Century, FTA, or are standard industry measures. Additional measures suggested by the Committee are shown in the attachment. Other discussion topics are summarized below.

Several committee members expressed interest in standardizing the definitions of measures. Sponsors should conform to standard Federal and regional definitions. Other Committee members observed that VMT reduction measures, or other length-of-trip performance measures are relevant to evaluating services. Project sponsors were urged to include such measures as they thought appropriate

The Committee agreed that if a sponsor assumes other revenue sources (e.g. general fund revenues) to subsidize the project or service, the sponsor must address the impacts on other previous commitments from that revenue source. Members of the committee differed on whether the farebox recovery ratio should include operating costs only. Ezra s opinion was that trunkline transit services should achieve at least 50% farebox recovery ratio, based on operating costs only.

MTC will look into the possibility of modeling the plan based on value added and other forecasting commitments; however, it is not clear that project level impacts will be apparent at that scale.

BART is developing a land use policy for system expansion. This policy will address travel throughout the day. Ezra stated that the principle purpose of the additional toll revenue is congestion relief, so the focus should be on peak commute periods, when congestion is greatest.

The Shinn connection could have big benefits for system connectivity. Ezra suggested that a group be formed with representatives of BART, ACE, Capitol Corridor, and Dumbarton Rail and funds be requested to study this connection. Howard Goode noted that some of the agencies are working together. Some work has been done and can be covered in the Dumbarton Rail presentation on September 6.

Sam Lau, BART, asked how system impacts might be addressed in the performance measures. For example, the Dumbarton Rail might result in more people taking BART transbay to San Francisco in the peak; however, capacity for this movement may be impacted and the additional demand would affect existing riders.

The HOV Master Plan, due from MTC by the end of the year, will look at novel approaches to enhance express bus service. To the extent possible, these should be factored into the toll plan. Caltrans will also participate in the design of the express bus program.

Measures addressing ridership may include all trips (not just transbay trips) if relevant; however, if a project serves transbay trips, the sponsor may wish to calculate the measures to transbay trips.

Topics Assigned to Future Meetings

Robert Rayburn will piggyback on presentation on AC, Muni, and BART access on August 30 to address bike/transit access.

Date of Meeting	**Main Topics**
July 26, 2002	Principles: 50/50 funding split between operating and capital Project performance measures and evaluation
Aug. 9, 2002	Project presentation: Water Transit Authority
Aug. 16, 2002	Project presentation: BART (capacity enhancements and seismic retrofit requirements)
Aug. 23, 2002	Project presentation: County Connection; Golden Gate and Marin County Bus, Express Bus discussion
Aug. 30, 2002	Project presentation: AC Transit, MUNI, BART Access
Sept. 6, 2002	Project presentation: Transbay Terminal, Caltrain Baby Bullet, Dumbarton Rail

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will be held on August 9, 2002 at 2 p.m. at the Alameda County CMA offices (1333 Broadway, Suite 220, Oakland). An updated list of Committee members will be provided at the next meeting.

Toll Bridge Advisory Committee
July 26, 2002 Meeting

Illustrative Performance Measures for Discussion

Performance Measure *(source)*	***Illustrative Projects***	
• Farebox recovery ratio *Demonstrates degree to which users pay for operation of the service (1)*	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement	New ferry service Rail extension
• Subsidy per (transbay) passenger - based on annualized capital and annual net operating cost *Demonstrates the total public investment per user (cost effectiveness)*	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement	New ferry service Rail extension
• Subsidy per new (transbay) transit rider - based on annualized capital and annual net operating cost Demonstrates the total public investment relative to congestion reduction potential. See new transit riders measure below. (cost effectiveness) (2,3)	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement	New ferry service Rail extension
• Passengers per revenue vehicle mile or revenue vehicle hour *Demonstrates utilization (service effectiveness) (1)*	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement	New ferry service Rail extension
• New (transbay) transit riders Demonstrates congestion reduction potential, assuming new transit riders were previously auto users (2)	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement	New ferry service Rail extension
• Travel time savings (for transbay trips) - could be measured as aggregate travel time savings for existing transit riders or point to point travel time savings *Measures benefits experienced by users*	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement	New ferry service Rail extension

Performance Measure *(source)*	***Illustrative Projects***	
• Number of passengers impacted Demonstrates extent of impacts even if impacts are not easily measured	Safety/security projects Terminal improvements	
• System connectivity — could be measured as composite reflection of number of connecting services, frequency of service, and temporal and spatial gap closure *(3)*	Night owl bus services Feeder bus services New rail service	
• System access measured as modes available to access new service or extension *(3)*	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement Feeder bus service Night owl bus services	New ferry service Rail extension
• Low income/disadvantaged communities served *(4)*	Express bus New rail service Rail service enhancement Night owl bus services	New ferry service Rail extension

Sources:
(1) Standard industry measure
(2) *Bay Area Blueprint for the 21st Century* (2000)
(3) Regional Transit Expansion Program Guidelines (2001)
(4) FTA criterion

Additional Measures Suggested by the Committee on July 26

- New ferry vessels or services shall meet WTAs emissions standard (85% below EPA Tier 2 (2007) requirements for NOx and PM)
  Suggested by Blue Water Network and Clean Ferry Coalition, by letter

- New public transit projects shall result in no net increase in air emissions
  Suggested by Blue Water Network and Clean Ferry Coalition, by letter

- Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) reduced
  Suggested as an alternative environmental measure to net increase in air emission. Also suggested as a way to address trip length

- Cumulative incremental transit passenger miles
  Suggested as a way to address trip length.

- Measure/discussion of reliability impacts
  Suggested as a way to show benefits of some rail projects that are aimed primarily at improving service reliability and travel time reliability.

- Measure benefits to disabled/special needs populations
  Suggested to complement the measure relating to low income/disadvantaged communities